



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,276	12/22/2005	David A. Fish	GB030102	6568
24737	7590	11/12/2008	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			PIZIALI, JEFFREY J	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2629	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/12/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/562,276	Applicant(s) FISH ET AL.
	Examiner Jeff Piziali	Art Unit 2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-14 and 16-29 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-14 and 16-29 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-146/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. The drawings have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the figures.

Specification

3. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Election/Restrictions

4. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group 1, *claims 1-14*, drawn to a method of determining pixel drive signals, classified in class 345, subclass 212 (e.g., *methods of controlling the power supplied to display elements*).

Group 2, *claims 16-29*, drawn to a display device (claims 16-26) and compensation circuitry (claims 27-29), classified in class 345, subclass 44 (e.g., *products having light emitting display elements*).

5. The inventions listed as ***Groups 1 and 2*** do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Any international application must relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (see MPEP 1850).

As demonstrated by the “*X*” and “*Y*” references on the International Search Report, at least one independent claim of the application does not avoid the prior art, therefore, the special technical feature of the application is anticipated by or obvious in view of the prior art.

Consequently, the inventions listed as ***Groups 1 and 2*** do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

Additionally, the inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

6. Invention ***Groups 2 and 1*** are related respectively as ***product and process of use***.

The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h).

(1) In the instant case, the process for using the product as claimed (*the method of claims 1-14*) can be practiced with another materially different product (*of claims 16-29*).

For example, the process as claimed (*the method of claims 1-14*) can be practiced with another materially different product (*of claims 16-29*) not including at least:

"A display device comprising an active matrix array of current-addressed light emitting display elements (2) arranged in rows and columns, comprising;" as claimed in independent claim 16 (lines 1-3),

"compensation circuitry for modifying target pixel drive currents to take account of a voltage on conductors associated with each of said rows (26) at each pixel resulting from

currents drawn from the row conductor by the plurality of pixels and a dependency of a brightness characteristics associated with a corresponding pixel on the voltage on the row conductor at the pixel," as claimed in independent claim 16 (*lines 4-9*),

"the compensation circuitry comprising: means (60, 62, 64, 66, 70, 72, 74, 76, 78, 80, 82, 90, 92) for applying an algorithm to the target pixel drive currents," as claimed in independent claim 16 (*lines 9-13*),

"means (100,104) for scaling the target drive currents resulting values using a value representing the dependency of the pixel brightness characteristics on the voltage on the row conductor," as claimed in independent claim 16 (*lines 14-16*);

"Compensation circuitry for modifying target pixel drive currents for a display device which comprises an active matrix array of current-addressed light emitting display elements arranged in rows and columns having respective row and column conductors," as claimed in independent claim 27 (*lines 1-4*),

"the compensation circuitry comprising: means (60, 62, 64, 66, 70, 72, 74, 76, 78, 80, 82, 90, 92) for applying an algorithm to the target pixel drive currents which represents the relationship between the currents drawn by the pixels in a row and the voltages on the row conductor at a corresponding location locations of the pixels," as claimed in independent claim 27 (*lines 4-8*), and

"means (100,104) for scaling the resulting values using a value representing a dependency of a pixel brightness characteristics on the voltage on the row conductor," as claimed in independent claim 27 (*lines 8-10*).

(2) In the instant case, the product as claimed (*in claims 16-29*) can be used in a materially different process of using that product (*than the method of claims 1-14*).

For example, the product as claimed (*in claims 16-29*) can be used in a materially different process of using that product (*than the method of claims 1-14*) without at least:

"A method of determining pixel drive signals to be applied to pixels of an array of light emitting display elements (2) arranged in rows and columns, with a plurality of pixels in a row being supplied with drive current simultaneously along a conductor associated with each of said rows (26), the method comprising;" as claimed in independent claim 1 (lines 1-5);

"determining target pixel drive currents corresponding to desired pixel brightness levels based on a model of pixel current-brightness characteristics," as claimed in independent claim 1 (lines 6-7);

"modifying the target pixel drive currents to take account of: a voltage on a corresponding the respective row conductor (26) at each pixel within a row resulting from the drive currents drawn by the plurality of pixels and a dependency of the pixel brightness characteristics on the voltage on a corresponding row conductor at the pixel," as claimed in independent claim 1 (lines 8-12); and

"determining the pixel drive signals from the modified target pixel drive currents," as claimed in independent claim 1 (line 13).

7. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is additionally proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there

would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

8. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Art Unit: 2629

9. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

10. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the

Art Unit: 2629

currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Piziali whose telephone number is (571)272-7678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (6:30AM - 3PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanh Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-7772. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeff Piziali/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2629
3 November 2008